

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Durant, Oklahoma

February 24-26, 2014

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission
A commission of the North Central Association

EVALUATION TEAM

Dr. Patricia A. Clanton, Associate Professor, Southern Arkansas University, Magnolia, AR
71754-9327

Dr. Erin J. Frew, Assistant Provost for Assessment & Student Learning, Colorado State
University-Pueblo, Pueblo, CO 81001-1057

Dr. Charlie Hurt, Professor, University of Wisconsin-River Falls, River Falls, WI 54022

Dr. Brian L. Mcguire, Associate Dean-College of Business, University of Southern Indiana,
Evansville, IN 47712

Dr. Joye H. Norris, Associate Provost of Assess & Outreach, Missouri State University,
Springfield, MO 65806 (chair)

Dr. Suzanne Shipley, President, Shepherd University, Shepherdstown, WV 25443-5000

Contents

I. Context and Nature of Visit.....	3
II. Commitment to Peer Review.....	3
III. Compliance with Federal Requirements	5
IV. Fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation	5
a. Criterion One	4
b. Criterion Two	9
c. Criterion Three.....	13
d. Criterion Four.....	19
e. Criterion Five	25
V. Team Recommendation.....	31
VI. Embedded Changes in Affiliation Status.....	32
VII. Additional Comments and Explanations	32
Attachments	
a. Interactions with Constituencies	33
b. Documents Reviewed.....	34
c. Federal Compliance Worksheet	37

I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit

This was a comprehensive evaluation visit to Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SE) following a decennial reaffirmation of accreditation.

B. Institutional Context

The visit included distance education review but did not include multi-campus review.

C. Unique Aspects or Additions to the Visit

None

D. Additional Locations or Branch Campuses Visited (if applicable)

NA

E. Distance Delivery Reviewed

Distance education including online and Interactive Educational Television (IETV) delivery were reviewed. The Institution is authorized by the Higher Learning Commission to offer 100% of its courses in distance mode. Although the figure varies from semester to semester and is also influenced by term (summer especially), approximately 21% of all courses offered in a semester are taught through online delivery and 3% through IETV. Approximately 15% of the general education courses offered by the Institution are taught in distance mode during a regular academic year. These numbers increase substantially during the summer term for all courses. The institution reports that, *in theory*, a student could complete all general education requirements via distance-delivery. In practice, this does not occur due to course and faculty availability and the sequence of distance-delivered courses versus traditionally delivered courses. Both undergraduate and graduate courses are offered via distance-delivery. Only two graduate programs are offered online: the Masters of Business Administration and the M.S. in Occupational Safety and Health. A M.S. in Aerospace Administration and Logistics is currently offered face-to-face and is in the planning stages to be offered 100% online. There are no undergraduate programs fully offered via distance-delivery. The determination of what courses and programs to offer via distance-delivery is within the purview of the faculty.

II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process

The self-study process was coordinated by the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs—Accreditation and Student Learning and involved seven sub-committees each examining one of the five criteria, previous concerns, and federal compliance. The committees had a cross-section of participants with one student representative on each committee. The self-study was framed by an institutional survey based on the core components of the HLC Criteria for Accreditation providing constituent attitudes and perceptions on a broad range of institutional values, processes, and outcomes. The survey data provided meaningful information for the self-study process and will help inform the institution in the future. There was broad knowledge of the self-study process and document by groups across campus.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report

SE viewed the self-study as a means of establishing feedback from the campus

community and through this process; the institution examined itself critically as a foundation for future planning efforts. The self-study report was consistent with feedback received through campus interviews and review of primary documents.

C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges

Following the last comprehensive visit, the Commission approved a monitoring report on assessment of general education at the university and department levels and a progress report on assessment of the library, student academic support services, and student affairs. The Team verified substantive progress and on-going data analysis for continuous improvement in these areas. There were 11 other concerns enumerated and in all instances SE has addressed the concerns to the fullest extent possible. In six areas including the involvement of students in the self-study process, constituency knowledge of institutional mission, documentation of student complaints, centralization of personnel files, development of a comprehensive enrollment management plan, and appointment of an ADA compliance officer, the institution corrected the deficiencies. There were several areas cited in the last report where the Team noted sufficient progress and an institutional commitment to on-going attention. Many of these areas require long-term commitment and resource allocations over many years. Through SE's planning and budget reallocation processes, SE is strategically strengthening faculty development and hiring of fulltime faculty, increasing diversity of faculty and staff, updating entrances to facilities for persons with disabilities and focusing on new construction to create a more welcoming environment for persons with disabilities, and allocating resources within annual budget cycles to deferred maintenance projects.

D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment

SE provided appropriate notification of the evaluation visit and solicited third-party comment. There was one comment received by the Commission which was determined not to warrant follow-up.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

APPENDIX C

IV. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

CRITERION ONE: MISSION. The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Core Component 1A: The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

Subcomponent 1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.

Subcomponent 2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.

Subcomponent 3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.

Team Determination: _X_Core Component is met

- Core Component is met with concerns
- Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- SE's mission is to offer an environment of academic excellence that enables students to reach their highest potential. The University seeks to foster cultural opportunities, economic growth, environmental quality, scientific and technological progress and social and personal well-being to the community of southeastern Oklahoma. The mission statement is accompanied by a functional set of 18 objectives, and these objectives, as well as the mission are well understood by internal and external stakeholders. This broad-based understanding of the mission was indicated in testimony by faculty, staff, students, and community members during the visit by the Team but also previously illustrated by elements of the strategic plan survey distributed as part of the self-study. During the open forum with faculty, there was expressed interest in shared deliberation on an updated academic vision for SE. It is believed by several groups on campus that the stronger governance and communication base built since the last self-study should lead to a process of revisiting the mission to test it in light of current tensions around funding and waning political support across the state of Oklahoma for higher education. The Team urges the institution to launch conversations around the current mission statement that is, though broadly understood and accepted, well positioned to affect new influence on direction and decision-making. (1A)
- In conversations with students, mission components related to career preparation and responsible citizenship resonated with them as they expressed enthusiasm for campus work experiences, service learning opportunities, and career focused internships. As SE leadership has expressed interest in renewing conversations about the mission, it would be useful to explore how the pillars of career preparation, responsible citizenship, and lifelong learning manifest throughout the SE college experience. In discussions with the Office of Career Services, it was evident that there were limited resources allocated to support this increasingly important student service. As fewer companies come to career days on campus, student needs for choosing and finding their professional niche and opportunities for life-long learning could be negatively impacted.
- SE received grants to support student services including a \$2 million Title III grant to promote retention and graduation of Native students. Through these grants and collaboration with the Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations, the institution recently opened the Native American Center for Student Success. Additionally, Project: Teach is a U.S. Department of Education grant awarded to SE, the only state institution and one of seven in higher education in the U.S. The mission of Project TEACH is to increase the retention and graduation of first generation students. Through these initiatives and realignment of academic support services within Student Affairs, SE has demonstrated commitment to its mission of meeting the needs of the community it serves.
- Students reported that attention of student affairs has focused on diversity initiatives perhaps at the exclusion of other areas of student development. There appeared to be limited funding dedicated to student activities, programming, and civic engagement, leaving students to assert that there is little to do after class hours, whether for residential or commuter students. It appeared that the institution's student support services are thinly spread in comparison to national norms. The Team urges the institution to provide students at SE with a well-rounded student experience that

embraces needs other than diversity, such as career development, internships, programming, and student governance.

Core Component 1B: The mission is articulated publicly.

Subcomponent 1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.

Subcomponent 2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.

Subcomponent 3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The mission, scope and function statements are widely available through electronic forms and distributed on a small trifold card for faculty and staff. As the mission has not been reviewed since the last comprehensive visit, it is recommended that the campus engage in discussions around the current mission statement, in order to publicly reiterate the appropriateness of mission or, if needed, to update and expand upon that mission to meet today's needs.
- The scope and function statements of the mission appear particularly well suited to regional needs and development of strategic partnerships. In the external stakeholders meeting, there was broad support of SE's leadership efforts. Tribal partners and others realize the integral role of SE in economic, cultural, and technological planning efforts.
- SE mission statement with the accompanying scope and function statements clearly outlines its commitment to constituents and the services it provides for students, faculty, staff, and the region.

Core Component 1C: The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

Subcomponent 1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.

Subcomponent 2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Not only are the numbers of students from diverse populations significantly greater since the last self-study but support services and facilities have been created to serve

them. The University mission states that a campus community responsive to the needs of a diverse population will be nurtured, and various activities for student, faculty, and staff support have been added. In particular, the regional community praised the close and historic ties between the University and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations. These relationships have brought strength to all parties and point toward future initiatives that could mutually benefit the tribes, which are flourishing economically, and the University that needs to find new audiences for its programs.

- The Team anticipated a celebration of the unique position this University holds with the Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations. Instead it appeared that diversity on the campus has become an effort to attract diverse populations not currently at home in this already diverse region, such as African American and international faculty, staff, and students. While laudatory, in a place of such limited resources the team is concerned that diversity efforts may be spread too thinly, thus potentially compromising the attention to the Native American population. The team encourages the institution to renew its focus upon those populations native to its region, since so few universities have the privilege to serve these constituents.
- Diversity within the ranks of faculty has not increased, despite attention to policies and practices that can support that goal, such as search committee training and minority candidate relationships with feeder institutions. Although applicant pools are increasing, there is still progress needed. The institution is urged to consider best practices in this regard used by members of the state regional university system or similar universities seeking to diversity faculty ranks
- SE recognizes the role of technology in meeting the needs of a diverse society through its development and delivery of online and IETV courses that support the mission of the institution directly by giving distance students' access to excellent teaching and challenging academic programs that those students would not otherwise be able to access.

Core Component 1D: The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

Subcomponent 1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.

Subcomponent 2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.

Subcomponent 3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- A key component of the mission statement for SE, a public regional institution, is to prepare students for careers and for responsible citizenship. Evident in its array of outreach activities is the awareness and acceptance of the special populations the University serves. Community members greatly appreciated the University's preparation of teachers for the region and its recently strengthened ability to develop

business leaders, employees, and new elements of economic development. Stakeholders pointed to summer academies, business development, and economic regional competitiveness initiatives now engaging faculty, students, and staff with their communities. The regional community group comprised of casino leaders, bankers, small business leaders, and local political representatives pointed out that the educational opportunities of the region were significant for students K-12 through graduate degrees.

- SE provided an extensive list of cultural, civic, and educational activities it sponsors throughout the year including an annual Shakespeare Festival. The division of Continuing Education helps SE meet its mission of life-long learning by providing courses in personal enrichment, health and fitness, computers, child development associate program, real estate, professional development training, tours, and summer youth camps. Additionally, classes are offered in a variety of formats making it easier for community participation.
- The various constituencies served by the institution appear to have reacted favorably if not enthusiastically to the concept of distance-delivered courses. The institution serves a rural and diverse community in southeastern Oklahoma and north Texas which lends itself to the delivery of distance coursework.
- One part of a survey done in anticipation of the Higher Learning Commission visit found that "...the majority of faculty believes the quality of programs is not the same across all modes of delivery..." (Self-Study, page 77). Several groups were asked about this finding (e.g., General Education Committee, Distance Education Council, general faculty, and students). There was no clear or conclusive response to or explanation for this finding. It is unclear whether the finding is based on perception or experience. Regardless, the Institution is strongly encouraged to examine this finding quickly. If based in experience, the institution needs to quickly and effectively address the problem(s) it finds. If the finding is based on perception, the institution needs to mount a vigorous informational campaign to address the issue(s). Faculty, staff, students, and constituents involved in (or not involved in) the distance-delivered courses or programs must be clear as to the worth and quality of any coursework offered by the institution.
- The University excels in meeting core component 1D.

Team Determination on Criterion One:

- Criterion is met
- Criterion is met with concerns
- Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

The institution's mission statement has served it well for over a decade. It is available in print, on the website, and is the first item to pop-up when using a mobile device to google the institution. The mission is broadly understood and multiple constituents verified that it met their needs. The scope and function statements appeared particularly well suited to development of partnerships and are realized through a myriad of economic-focused initiatives, life-long learning opportunities, and cultural experiences sponsored by SE. Education is SE's primary focus and it demonstrates commitment to serving the public good by meeting the educational needs of the region and continuing to plan for the future.

CRITERION TWO: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct. The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Component 2A: The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The University appears particularly cognizant of the requirements placed upon it as a state institution. The following governing laws guide SE, which is under the oversight of the coordinating board the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) as well as the governing board of the six regional institutions, the Board of Regents for the Regional University System of Oklahoma (RUSO). While these two entities establish the framework and management policy, the University implements and sets those university policies that ensure academic freedom, integrity and transparency under concepts of shared governance. A number of graduate and undergraduate academic councils and committees interface to make academic decisions that move through the Academic Council to the VPAA and President before moving forward to the RUSO and the OSRHE. The University also hosts a distance education council to ensure the standards set by the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB) for distance education are met.
- Academic policies are detailed in the University Catalog and enforced in conjunction with the Office of the Registrar. That office complies with all federal and state statutes and those policies published by FERPA.
- Multiple committees work to enhance and defend equity and diversity, working primarily in collaboration with the Office of Equity, Compliance, and Diversity.
- A six point statement of ethics guides the operations of the Office of Business Affairs. External audits of the financial statements and of Federal Student Financial Aid are reported to the president and the oversight boards regularly. Internal audits follow the regulations of RUSO Policy Manual-handbook, as do the monitoring of all accounting standards and the operational budget, grants, and contracts.
- The Southeastern Foundation is a separate 501(c) (3) administered by the Office of University Advancement and governed by an independent Board of Trustees.
- RUSO requires annual reviews of University financial statements by an external auditor. The 2012-13 external audit resulted in three findings that are not considered material weakness.
- All distant faculty, whether full-time or adjunct, and all staff are subject to the same institutional policies and processes as those of face-to-face faculty and staff.
- Students in distance-delivered courses offered at a specific site are required to produce government issued identification that verifies their identity to a member of the institution's staff. Students not taking the coursework at a specific site must present a notarized copy of government issued identification in order to complete their registration. During the course of the semester, students may be asked at sites to

confirm their identity. Students not taking a course at a specific site may be asked to confirm their identity via the webcam. The Institution is encouraged to consistently ensure student authentication and identity, and to communicate that process clearly to faculty and students.

Core Component 2B: The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Through its publications, processes, and structures, SE reflects its awareness of the importance of acting with integrity. Professional standards and compliance with all federal, state and local laws are maintained. University policies and procedures are outlined in the University Administrative, Professional and Support Staff Employee Handbook and academic policies are found in the SE Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. Alongside the University catalog and the Student Handbook, regulations and requirements are clearly outlined for the community and the public it serves on the websites of schools, departments, and sites describing requirements for enrollment, graduation, and general education.
- The promotion and marketing of courses offered via distance technology is handled in exactly the same way as traditional courses, including approval of web and paper copy by the University Communications Office. The only differences in terms of promotion, marketing, and enrollment between a distance-delivered course and a face-to-face course are a “W” designation in the course numbering system in the schedule of courses and a descriptor, either “online” or “hybrid” added as a part of the course description and the dates when the hybrid courses will meet face-to-face are listed.
- SE has done an admirable job acquiring and maintaining specialized accreditations such as AACSB, CACREP, CAEP, NASM, and AAB International and presents itself clearly on program materials and their website.

Core Component 2C: The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

Subcomponent 1. The governing board’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.

Subcomponent 2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.

Subcomponent 3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.

Subcomponent 4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Team Determination: Core Component is met

- Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The coordinating board, OSRHE, comprises a system of 25 colleges and universities and the governing board, RUSO, oversees the six regional institutions in particular. Both sets of regents are appointed by the Governor in staggered terms, and their appointments relate to counties in which the regional institutions are located. While the RUSO Board maintains authority over the University, the internal management of the institution is delegated to the president. The president is widely respected, very approachable, and highly visible. The Board and the university community consider his leadership a strong and positive factor in the stability of the University and point to the effectiveness of the executive team in maintaining the autonomy with the governing board through practices that align with its expectations. The faculty is held accountable for the delivery of the academic affairs of the institution, by policy and practice.
- There is concern among members of the Team that the setting of tuition, which is a purview of the individual regional institutions under the oversight of RUSO, is in danger of becoming a political power play for legislative oversight. It is feared that should the legislature control and ultimately freeze tuition indefinitely, the quality of educational initiatives would decline to a significant degree, particularly if the state continues to reduce support for higher education. Continued autonomy of the Board in relation to setting tuition, is crucial to the continued well-being of SE.
- In 2011, RUSO established EthicsPoint, an anonymous reporting system for students, employees, visitors, and vendors to report known or suspected policy violations in the following categories: athletics, financial, human resources, information technology, medical, research, risk and safety matters, and student affairs. This RUSO tip line system provides a formal mechanism for investigation, follow-up and response.
- The RUSO Board conducts annual presidential reviews based on nine criteria: strategic planning, fiscal management, quality of educational programs, accreditation status, quality of faculty and staff, fund raising goals, relations with constituents, internal campus assessments, physical plant, and faculty/staff compensation goals and sources.

Core Component 2D: The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

- Team Determination:** Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Three core documents and a wide variety of policies and practices indicate adherence to academic freedoms at the institution. For faculty who feel their academic freedom has been compromised, the Faculty Appellate Committee oversees appeals.
- The Student Handbook and Student Code of Conduct perform similar roles for the students, with an emphasis on avoiding plagiarism and cheating.

Core Component 2E: The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

Subcomponent 1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.

Subcomponent 2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

Subcomponent 3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Policies on academic integrity and honesty, on research oversight and support, research using human subjects, and on ethical actions by students are clearly stated and published on numerous sites at the University including multiple places on the Institution's web site. Faculty, staff, or students who seek funded research are given clear guidelines by the staff members in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs prior to initiating a proposal.
- The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs has a Human Subjects Committee and protocols to protect both research and subjects. An Institutional Review Board is in place to address questions of ethical and appropriate research practices. In addition, funding supports undergraduate research and faculty and staff professional opportunities. Each year, several faculty members attend a grant writing workshop during which research integrity and academic are addressed.
- Southeastern provides the oversight, structure, and support for the responsible acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge by its students, staff, and faculty. For example, the Human Subjects Research Review Committee (HSRRC) is responsible for reviewing all research protocols for any project at SE involving human subjects. The HSRRC reviews each proposal to determine if the rights and welfare of human subjects are protected and that appropriate methods are used to obtain informed consent. A project cannot proceed until it receives approval from the HSRRC.
- In addition, some departments may have additional guidelines that are specific to their particular areas. For example, the Department of Biological Sciences has an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) that has guidelines related to the use of animals in research. The IACUC makes sure that all of SE's research complies with the regulations set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- The Organized Research Fund assists faculty members to participate in research and other scholarly activities. The Organized Research and Program Review Committee (ORPRC) reviews applications and recommends the level of support to the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs on a periodic basis. During the current academic year, the faculty research budget in the Organized Research Fund increased from \$37,218 to \$77,218 as a result of discussions with faculty members.
- Over the last five years, 186 faculty grant requests were funded through the ORPRC. In addition, conversations with the committee revealed that applications are submitted and reviewed each semester and most requests are funded. If not funded, the committee provides feedback on how the proposals could be strengthened and resubmitted for future funding cycles.
- The RUSO policy manual includes research and scholarship as one of five categories required for consideration for promotion and academic rank. At the beginning of each academic year SE faculty submit a Faculty Development Plan that describes goals and

efforts in meeting the criteria. At the conclusion of the year, department chairs evaluate faculty plans and produces a faculty Evaluation Form for each faculty member. The self-study document reports that while teaching is a primary focus, scholarship and creative activities are considered essential as they inform teaching.

- Student research is conducted through elective or required classes. Academic integrity guidelines are outlined in the Student Handbook/Code of Conduct and in many course syllabi. Student research may be presented at the annual SE Brainstorm research symposium and Oklahoma Research Day.

Team Determination on Criterion Two:

- Criterion is met
 Criterion is met with concerns
 Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

SE operates within a regional university system under oversight of a Board with developed policies and practices such as EthicsPoint that helps to ensure integrity. The institution has well-articulated policies to guide academic practices including shared governance structures. Administrators clearly articulated their responsibilities in maintaining records, resolving formal student complaints, and presenting the University accurately. There is a balanced approach to teaching, scholarship, and service with institutional forums for presentation of original and creative works. There are sufficient protocols to protect both research and subjects. Funding to support faculty research increased for the past academic year and most faculty proposals are funded.

CRITERION THREE: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support. The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Component 3A: The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

Subcomponent 1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

Subcomponent 2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

Subcomponent 3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- In the review of syllabi, all courses and programs are current and require a level of performance by students that is appropriate. Learning goals are clearly listed for most

courses for which the syllabi were available. However, learning goals should be included for all courses.

- A review of program assessment plans and reports indicated that all programs possess student learning outcomes. Furthermore, learning goals for undergraduate and graduate courses were appropriately differentiated.
- The institution has made a concerted effort administratively and at the faculty level to ensure that traditionally delivered courses and distance-delivered courses are equivalent in terms of quality and learning goals.
- There is no differentiation for assessment purposes between a traditionally delivered course and a distance-delivered course.
- Distance-delivered courses and programs are managed through well-defined organizational structures. All courses and programs proposed for distance-delivery must move through the appropriate department to the Distance Education Council (DEC), a shared governance committee. Once approved by the DEC, the proposal moves through the established administrative approval process. All financial resources and the management of those resources are handled in exactly the same way as face-to-face courses. Just as no distinction is made academically between face-to-face and distance-delivered courses, there is no difference in the financial resources and their management.

Core Component 3B: The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

Subcomponent 1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

Subcomponent 2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

Subcomponent 3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

Subcomponent 4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

Subcomponent 5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree level of the institution.
- The large number of general education outcomes (43 across 10 learning goals) may well be excessive and the magnitude of the assessment and data collection processes

may exceed the resources of SE. The site visit team encourages the SE faculty to revise and prioritize the general education student learning outcomes in such a way that fewer of them are actually assessed. The campus may find meaningful improvement easier to sustain over time with an austere, effective assessment plan.

- The general education program is well-articulated in the publications and the web site for the institution.
- Examination of course syllabi for the academic year 2013-2014 indicates that programs and courses appropriately engage students in intellectual inquiry and creative work.

Core Component 3C: The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

Subcomponent 2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

Subcomponent 3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

Subcomponent 4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

Subcomponent 5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

Subcomponent 6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The institution currently has sufficient continuity and numbers of faculty to carry out classroom and non-classroom roles although there is some concern on the part of the faculty that adjuncts are being used too heavily and that additional faculty and replacement faculty will be near-term problems.
- All instructors have the appropriate credentials for their academic areas.
- All instructors, regardless of delivery mode or location, are evaluated by department chairs.
- Faculty members are required to keep a minimum number of office hours. However, adjunct faculty members are not required to keep office hours, and in many cases do not have an office or work space provided.
- Faculty can work with the Center for Instructional Design and Technology (CIDT) to hone skills in curriculum design and technology. Faculty members are not required to work with CIDT.
- Faculty primarily self-selects to offer distance-delivered courses. When an adjunct is hired, the department is the quality control point for the hire. All faculty teaching online

courses must be certified via Quality Matters. Orientation is handled by the department and is the same process as orientation for any faculty member at the Institution.

Core Component 3D: The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

Subcomponent 1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

Subcomponent 2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.

Subcomponent 3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.

Subcomponent 4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).

Subcomponent 5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- SE provides a variety of means for directing student to courses and programs that they are prepared to begin. The Counseling Center, Student Health Services, Southeastern's Talent Search Educational Program Services are among the programs that are provided to support student learning.
- SE uses a blended advising model in which professional advisors in the Academic Advising Center advise students with less than 24 credit hours, undecided majors, transfer students and students with academic deficiencies. University faculty typically advise students who have completed 24 hours or who have chosen a major course of study.
- The technological infrastructure is in place to support both students and faculty. For example, the institution is a member of One Net, a statewide technology consortium that provides high quality networking to the institution, SE also maintains a variety of other resources such as discipline-specific laboratories, clinical practice sites, the Charles and Miriam Hogan Native American Art Collection, and the Henry G. Bennett Memorial Library.
- SE students have experiences in the effective use of research and information resources. In the general education program, at least two classes emphasize the use of research and information. The effective use of research and information resources is also emphasized in required courses for major programs of study.
- Technology related to distance-delivered courses is handled by the Information Technology Department. An example of the process is the recent upgrade to the latest version of Blackboard. The IT Department informed the campus of the impending upgrade and outcome via Blackboard, the Institution's web site, email, and notices to

departments and offered support through the CIDT and the IT department. As part of a state OneNet consortium, the institution does not have direct control of this technology but does have input and informs the campus of any changes. The IT Department maintains an active Help Desk to assist students, faculty, and staff and the CIDT provides course delivery support.

- The majority of students noted that access to faculty teaching online was good but could be improved. Specific faculty members were noted who spent considerable time and effort via chat sessions, video conferencing, and electronic office hours. In the minority were comments about professors who taught their distance class and were not readily available otherwise. SE needs to address the unevenness of student access to faculty and expand the processes to promote interactions beyond the classroom, virtual or otherwise.
- Students taking distance-delivered courses at a specific site have access to staff members at that site who assist with services such as counseling, registration, technology, and financial services. Students not taking courses at a specific site have access via email and other technologies to staff members at the Durant campus. Library access is via technology. The library is engaged in making its services electronically available regardless of delivery mode of a course or program.

Core Component 3E: The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

Subcomponent 1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

Subcomponent 2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The Office of Student Life offers a variety of co-curricular activities that provide students with opportunities for personal growth. SE has over 50 active student organizations that provide students with social and academic opportunities for personal growth.
- Numerous enrichment opportunities are available including the BioScience Research Area; Center for Leadership, Entrepreneurship, and Graduate Studies; Cooperative for Education Program with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and others. Two community-oriented programs are also offered: Southeastern Oklahoma Eldercare and Continuing Education.

Team Determination on Criterion Three:

Criterion is met
 Criterion is met with concerns
 Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

SE demonstrates robust programs with well-defined learning outcomes for the majority of courses. Undergraduate and graduate courses are differentiated and taught by qualified faculty. Rigor and appropriate academic and technology oversight is maintained for distance delivered courses. Academic advising and student support services are planned and articulated. Faculty office hours are required yet students expressed some concern regarding opportunities to interact with online faculty. Students have opportunities to conduct research and participate in a myriad of University sponsored activities. Technology infrastructure is present to support current campus needs.

CRITERION FOUR: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Core Component 4A: The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

Subcomponent 1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

Subcomponent 2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.

Subcomponent 3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

Subcomponent 4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

Subcomponent 5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.

Subcomponent 6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Consistent with OSRHE policy, SE conducts program review every five years for graduate and undergraduate programs. The evidence examined and interviews with faculty and administrators confirmed that the academic units actively engage in reviewing their programs. Furthermore, programs offered in part or in whole employing distance modalities are reviewed by discipline faculty using the same

process and the same level of standards expected for face-to-face offerings. For example, the MBA—an online program offered by the AACSB-accredited business school— is reviewed by business school faculty. The results of the program review are used as the basis for developing a plan of action to improve the program.

- The campus is attempting to make the program review process more meaningful by tying it to allocation decisions. For example, open faculty budget lines are no longer filled based on history, but are linked to need evidenced through program review or accreditation self-study. The academic administration plans to tie other funding requests (e.g., equipment) to the program review in the future.
- The registrar's office at SE implements processes to consistently and accurately evaluate the credit it transcripts and their quality.
- Through interviews with faculty and staff and a review of process documentation, it is clear that SE monitors the quality of its courses and student learning outcomes and faculty credentials are regularly evaluated.
- SE has successfully obtained and continues to maintain specialty accreditation for its business, aviation, education, counseling, and music programs. Faculty from these respective departments prepares self-study documents and engages in quality assurance processes on an ongoing basis.
- The Career Center conducts a survey of graduates to identify job placement and graduate study after graduation. The response rates on the survey are low and the Career Center staff indicated an interest in using social media approaches to improve tracking and reporting. Some programs require students to create a LinkedIn account as part of the senior capstone class making it easier for programs to stay in touch with graduates as their careers progress. Furthermore, the pass rates of professional certification and licensure of students and graduates signal that they are being well prepared for careers. While the pass rates for the Certified Public Accountant is 33 percent and lower than the average national uniform CPA examination passing rates, they appear to be consistent with pass rates from similar post-secondary institutions in Oklahoma.
- SE accepts credits earned at two-year and four-year institutions that are accredited by a regional accrediting association. Upon submission of official transcripts from regionally accredited institutions, transfer credit is evaluated and recorded for all students admitted and enrolled at Southeastern. All transfer courses are recorded regardless of grade earned or equivalency to show the student's complete academic record. Credit is evaluated by the registrar for current equivalencies based on the OSRHE transfer equivalency project. Transfer credits are accepted and applied to degree programs in accordance with the recommendations in the Transfer Credit Practices Guide published by AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers), guidelines for transfer of credit from OSRHE, and approved articulation agreements.
- SE exercises several academic processes that review degree programs along with course content ensuring rigor and current relevance. Academic departments are responsible for the composition of degree elements and course prerequisites, especially the major requirements. Academic rigor is maintained regardless of enrollment (e.g., dual credit). Classes typically taken as dual enrollment or as a concurrent student include general education classes such as English Composition I and II, U.S. Federal Government, and College Algebra.
- There is no distinction at the institution between a distance-delivered course and a traditional course. The same evaluation and assessment tools are used. The institution

has become a member of Quality Matters. All faculty requesting to teach online must be certified by Quality Matters. Several faculty members are working toward certification as course designers and Quality Matters instructors. Learning objectives for distance-delivered courses are equivalent to traditionally-delivered courses. Assessment and evaluation of distance-delivered courses are the same processes as are used for traditionally-delivered courses. Department chairs regularly (either semester by semester or year by year, depending on the department) examine assessment and evaluation data and make suggestions for changes.

- Both the General Education Committee and the Distance Education Council have noted and are beginning to address what they have identified as the “DFW Problem” (grades of D, F, or a Withdrawal). In 2012-2013, 39 general education courses were offered using both delivery formats. The DFW rate was higher for online courses in 26 comparisons and face-to-face courses for 13 comparisons. As the institution notes, this is not statistically significant, but it suggests a pattern warranting attention.

Core Component 4B: The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

Subcomponent 2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

Subcomponent 3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

Subcomponent 4. The institution’s processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- SE has made a great deal of improvement in student learning outcomes assessment since the last decennial period. A review of the assessment plans indicates that most programs have developed measureable student learning outcomes and have designed processes to evaluate them that include such techniques as standardized nationally-normed tests, locally developed exams, and course-embedded artifacts of student learning. SE recently subscribed to TaskStream, an assessment and effectiveness management system. Upon review, it appears that the system is in the process of being adopted across the campus with potential for improving the efficiency and usefulness of data generated in the future. Currently, the system is used primarily by academic programs for assessment plans and reports though other academic affairs units are beginning to adopt it as well. Academic programs should take care to fully implement the curriculum mapping features of the system as a way to assure the curriculum provides multiple, high-quality opportunities for student to learn the outcomes the program faculty established.

- The Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs for Student Learning and Accreditation indicated that the campus goal is to populate TaskStream in such a way that assessment and program review information can be accurately and effectively used together to inform strategic and budgetary planning based on evidence of effectiveness. This is a work in progress and a great deal of attention will need to be focused in this area to realize this goal. The Team strongly encourages SE to fully use assessment and program review information for improvement, planning, and budget decisions.
- SE has established learning outcomes assessment for its curriculum but it is still developing assessment in other areas within and outside academic affairs. Academic Advising and the Learning Center are among the units engaging in the assessment of learning outcomes and other programs are scheduled to come on board over the next two years. The General Education Council guides the assessment of general education. With embedded assessment processes, standardized tests, and other assessment methods for over 40 student learning outcomes, the general education assessment process is complex. The academic department offering each general education course conducts assessment and uses assessment information for improvement in that department. The General Education Council does not currently possess a process by which qualitative and quantitative data from across departments are synthesized and acted upon to improve the general education curriculum. Without this process, silos of assessment information will have to be crossed to assure that the entire campus owns assessment of general education student learning outcomes and assumes responsibility for improvement.
- A review of assessment reports and interviews with faculty indicate an increasing trend in the use of assessment information since the last HLC self-study. Initially, efforts resulted in improvement to the process itself such as refinements to methods and rubrics but in the past year or two there is evidence that assessment is increasingly resulting in improvements to student learning. Programs with specialty accreditation were initial adopters of sound assessment practices, but assessment reports and summaries of assessment activities to the OSRHE indicate that a tipping point has been reached and the move toward authentic engagement in assessment has become prevalent across the academic units.
- The Institutional Assessment Committee adopted a peer review process for evaluating and providing feedback to academic departments regarding their assessment reports. Its members review reports and utilize a rubric to provide feedback to the departments on each one. This process involves faculty, promotes a shared understanding of student learning at SE, and provides a mechanism for sharing promising practices. This process would be improved if the results of assessment were discussed by the Institutional Assessment Committee. Perhaps the committee could make recommendations for professional development (e.g., assessment workshops, pedagogy development session, brown bag discussion) to the Center for Instructional Development and Technology and to administrators for enhancing support of assessment across campus. In faculty interviews, some expressed concern that assessment is becoming burdensome. SE should consider adopting a staggered system of assessing outcomes and seek to streamline the assessment of general education student learning outcomes to assure that the information the processes generate can be used consistently to improve student learning.

- The primary purpose of the Center for Instructional Development and Technology is to support the technology needs of the campus and its faculty. It does not currently employ academic program or general education assessment information to plan faculty professional development activities. SE will be more effective in the future if the pedagogical needs of faculty and programs rather than the expertise of its staff drive the CIDT's offerings. A review of the assessment reports for trends in gaps in student learning, consultation with the Institutional Assessment Committee, needs assessment surveys, and faculty feedback should be the basis on which workshops and training sessions are offered.

Core Component 4C: The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.

Subcomponent 2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.

Subcomponent 3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

Subcomponent 4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- SE joined the *Complete College America* and *Compete to Complete* efforts as part of a state-wide initiative to improve persistence and graduation rates by increasing the number of its graduates by 25 per year for the next five years. Institutional data are currently collected and used to track student persistence for its native and transfer students.
- In the past two-and-one-half years, SE established a retention and graduation task force of faculty and staff to address issues of student persistence. The task force members possess a great deal of enthusiasm and dedication to their goals and have established an extensive list of recommendations for improvement. SE should attempt to systematically address as many of these recommendations as its resources will allow.
- The mandatory advisement policy has the potential to improve completion rates in the future. However, it is clear that some majors have more success in retaining students than others. Perhaps a review across departments can establish campus-level promising practices for retaining students.

- The site visit team urges the campus to evaluate its student engagement activities as a way to improve graduation rates. More events (e.g., speakers, research presentations, readings and discussions) would enliven and energize the campus and create an environment of commitment to scholarship and learning.

Team Determination on Criterion Four:

- Criterion is met
 Criterion is met with concerns
 Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

The General Education Council oversees general education assessments including standardized tests and other forms of assessment processes. Currently there is no means to synthesize general education assessment data across departments resulting in silos of assessment information. The recent introduction of TaskStream as a mechanism for tracking and reporting assessment data holds promise as a means of aggregating and acting up the outcomes. As SE refines the system, it will be important to tie faculty development to assessment results and monitor critical general education outcomes. Areas such as Academic Advising and the Learning Center are engaged in assessment activities and other programs are working toward that end. It was apparent that a culture of assessment is developing across the institution. A retention and graduation task force of faculty and staff was created to examine student persistence resulting in an extensive list of recommendations for improvement for SE to act on.

CRITERION FIVE: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Component 5A: The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

Subcomponent 2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

Subcomponent 3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.

Subcomponent 4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

Subcomponent 5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Some very good progress has been made in the financial picture of the University. The CFI increased from .55 to 2.43 in the period between 2008 and 2013. Reserves are approaching 8.3% of the overall budget, up from 3.6% in 2008. But salaries continue to lag behind peer and regional averages, creating challenges to morale and causing others to question the increasing reliance on adjunct instructors. There is little reason to expect significant increases in funding from the state of Oklahoma and the University is seeking alternative revenue sources through a multi-pronged approach to recruit and retain students, increase retention and completion, and attract international students. Targeted programs for northern Texas are expected to increase enrollment and revenues.
- The Southeastern Foundation supports University programs by receiving donations from alumni, local businesses, corporations, faculty, staff and other foundations. The primary purpose of the Foundation is to have a significant impact on the academic life of the University. Assets have grown over the last ten years from \$9.2 million to \$27.1 million. This amount includes a \$9.8 million new housing facility built in 2006 when Southeastern and the Foundation entered into a lease/management agreement.
- Southeastern Foundation assets (not including the housing facilities) have increased from \$12.5 million to \$20.3 million (62%) over the past five years. In FY2011-12, the Foundation's revenues were \$4.7 million and expenses were \$2.2 million, increasing assets by \$2.5 million.
- Southeastern Foundation provides annual support to the University through scholarships, chairs, professorships, lectureships, and operational support. Over the past five years, the Foundation has provided \$1.2 million in scholarships, \$500,000 in funding chairs, professorships, and lectureships, and \$1.9 million in operational support, which represents a total of \$3.6 million.
- The significant growth in the Southeastern Foundation has been attributed to the leadership of the Foundation board of directors and the University. Over the past five years, the growth of the foundation has included forty-four new endowed scholarships and six academic enhancement endowments. New scholarship endowments total \$3.3 million and \$605,000 in new academic enhancement endowments, which includes one endowed chair, one endowed professorship, and four academic enhancement endowments.
- The Team recognizes the good results of the many action teams produced by the Harvard initiative and especially notes the success of the mascot change.
- SE's budgeting processes ties resource allocations to program growth by returning vacant faculty lines to a central pool to be distributed based on increase in majors, enrollment growth, accreditation mandates, and new program development. At the time of the last comprehensive visit there were 51 undergraduate and 9 graduate programs. In 2013-14 there were 39 undergraduate majors and 12 graduate majors. Resource allocation decisions tied to productivity and assessment outcomes provide institutional focus and increased efficiencies.

Core Component 5B: The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and

students—in the institution’s governance.

Subcomponent 2. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution’s financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

Subcomponent 3. The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- There are sufficient governance and administrative structures in place to assure shared governance function effectively. There are multiple attempts to measure the success of shared governance, including surveys that seem to be taken very seriously and acted upon. There is indication that communication and trust are improving with the presidency of Dr. Larry Minks and his efforts since 2010 to link the executive staff/administration with the Faculty Senate, the SGA and the SSA.
- SE’s HLC Self-Study Survey asked the campus community to rate the two oversight Boards (RUSO and OSRHE) relative to making decisions in the best interest of the institution. In the case of RUSO, 56% of the respondents agreed and for OSRHE 58% agreed that their actions benefited the institution. The policies are clearly delineated for each Board as they coordinate higher education activities. RUSO is responsible for management policies and operations of regional universities (six total) such as SE including employing personnel, establishing salaries, and contracting services. OSRHE is responsible for setting educational standards, coordinating program offerings, and recommending state funding levels for institutions. RUSO makes recommendations to the OSRHE coordinating board.
- The faculty members at SE are actively involved in shared governance. The faculty has primary responsibility in such areas as curriculum, instruction methods, faculty appointment and status, tenure and promotion. There are four principal vehicles for faculty participation in shared governance: The Faculty Senate, General Faculty Committees, Academic Chairs, and the Forum on Shared Governance.
- The Faculty Senate typically meets once or twice a month during the academic year and the meetings are open to all faculty. Administrators, staff, and students are also welcome to attend when they have issues (or information) for the Faculty Senate. In addition, the Faculty Senate surveys the faculty annually to measure the general opinion on processes and other subjects, such as morale, the relationship between the faculty and the administration, tenure and promotion, and/or salary issues.
- The faculty members at SE also engage in shared governance through participation in the general faculty committees. Each committee has both a function and membership statement determined by the Faculty Senate. These committees also include student representatives where appropriate and often guarantee broad faculty representation and perspectives by requiring a certain number of faculty members from each school. Examples of general faculty committees include the Curriculum Committee (which makes recommendations on both interdisciplinary and departmental majors and minors), Academic Appeals, the Student Personnel Policies Committee, the Organized

Research and Program Review Committee (which review mini-grant proposals for faculty research and travel), and the Graduate Council.

- Students participate in shared governance through the Student Government Association (SGA) and serve on university committees such as academic appeals, curriculum, assessment, homecoming, and the HLC Self-Study committee. During the student forum, the Team found the students to be knowledgeable, interested, and vocal relative to campus issues.
- The fifteen chairs of the academic departments play an important role in SE's shared governance process. In addition to coordinating the curricula for the major and minor concentrations in the academic disciplines, the department chairs prepare and submit departmental budgets, work with individual faculty on their annual faculty development plans and evaluations, and make recommendations on tenure and promotion applications from within their department. While the department chairs are responsible to the Dean of Instruction, they are nominated by the faculty within their department and must be approved by the President (after recommendations have been made by the Dean of Instruction and the Vice President for Academic Affairs). The department chairs are evaluated annually with a comprehensive evaluation done every fourth year.
- One issue with the department chairs is that there is no policy governing the appointment or evaluation of interim chairs. Given the importance of department chairs (particularly with regard to faculty control of the curriculum), having a long-term interim chair or a departmental-administrative impasse over chair nominees can undermine the strength and independence of an academic department. Therefore, it is the goal of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Instruction to work with departmental faculty to identify a department chair as soon as judiciously possible.
- To continue to improve performance at SE, a team was selected over several years to attend programming at Harvard University. Upon completion of their Harvard programs, returning leaders offered professional development sessions for members of the campus. They formed groups to create action plans that corresponded to overarching issues or concerns at the University, and the changes to the organization of the University were measured and tracked. Eight teams in total worked on these action plans, which continue to evolve from short term solutions to longer term initiatives. A total of 30 plans are being integrated into the strategic plan of the University. Outcomes include improved communication across leadership groups and continuing work on organizational change.
- A chapter of AAUP has been added since the last self-study was written and is described in this study as enhancing collaboration around issues such as compensation and other employee benefits like tuition remission for dependents. While the number of faculty and the number of tenured faculty has seen a modest decrease over the past decade, indication of active committee decision-making in regard to shaping the identity and mission of SE were evident in the self-study. It is not obvious in practice, however, based upon discussions with the faculty as a whole and the Senate executive committee that a sufficient level of engagement in planning exists. Whether this is by design by those faculties choosing disengagement or through the fault of administrative structures or systems providing confusion, there is a gap between what the administration perceives to be the planning process and its results and what the faculty perceives to be happening in this regard. Two telling statements were made in meetings with the faculty as a whole and the faculty senate executive committee. "We have a voice but not a vote." "We need to move from dialog to deliberation." Common agreement appeared to exist that decisions may still be made at the executive level without input or guidance from those the decisions

affect, and that governance could be better served if processes were put in place to vet priorities and decisions before they are made. Faculty groups reiterated that they understand the need for rapid and sometimes urgent timelines but encourage the administration to move beyond the structures built by the Harvard initiatives to reach out through established governance bodies to discuss decisions before they are firmly in place.

- The primary process determining need for offerings or expansion of distance-delivered courses or programs is the interest and desire of the faculty in a particular program. In some cases, such as the Aviation programs, external forces or student demand may be an impetus. The institution is adamant that the responsibility for determination of whether or not to offer distance-delivered courses or programs is the responsibility of the faculty.

Core Component 5C: The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

Subcomponent 1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

Subcomponent 2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

Subcomponent 3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

Subcomponent 4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

Subcomponent 5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The planning processes utilized by SE are based on a Harvard approach to case study where a probable institutional scenario is reviewed, analyzed, and discussed resulting in recommendations to create a positive future outcome. One particularly important scenario was a budget case study reflecting higher education budget realities. From 2009 to present, the planning process involved large and small discussion groups that evolved into eight action teams comprised of 11-12 participants per group representing a cross-section of the University including administration (29), staff (22), faculty (29) and students (8). The discussion process identified University challenges and opportunities developing action plans around common themes. The eight working groups assumed responsibility for the short-term action plans including academic planning and programming review, civic engagement, I AM SE (campus beatification), Blue/Gold – including Mascot creation, stipend/salary/morale, a True Blue campus/community project, a master planning calendar, development of a Founder's Day event (SE history and identification), internal communication (Yammer eCommunication system), and improved billing statements for students. As demonstrated through discussions with

various campus entities, there are many tangible outcomes of SE planning processes.

- Over the past several years, SE has been able to create a budget reserve while adding 5 full-time faculty lines, building a general education classroom building, student center, up-grading residence halls, providing salary increases, and putting additional resources into web services, faculty development, and research support. During the faculty forum, faculty commented that President Minks has righted the ship, the University has turned a corner, and communication has improved. One faculty voiced concern about enrollment and the need to continually assess actions in light of the recent dip in enrollment.
- The budget development process begins with the institution identifying budget priorities and fixed-cost increases based on system-wide and institutional strategic plans, with limitations varying from year to year (depending on the political and economic climate). Institutions must prioritize and submit cost estimates for faculty and staff salary increases, new faculty positions, graduate assistant and staff positions, library acquisitions, and other maintenance and operations support. The RUSO office compiles the aggregated requests into a higher education system request, which is presented to the Governor in December and to the Legislature in January. By May, the Legislature passes the appropriation bill and the Governor signs it into law.
- The Board of Equalization is responsible for providing an estimate of all revenue that will be available for appropriation by the Oklahoma Legislature for the coming fiscal year. The Governor, through the Oklahoma Office of Management and Enterprise Services, then uses that estimate to prepare and submit the State's annual budget for approval by the Legislature.
- During the fall semester, budget data (along with the economic conditions) are presented to the Executive Committee, Administrative Council, the Executive and Budget Committees of the Faculty Senate, and the Executive Committee of the Staff Association. Members of these groups then start communicating this information to their specific constituencies (i.e., Budget Units).
- The Budget Units attempt to determine budgetary needs beginning at the individual faculty (staff) member level. In the academic area, the Vice President of Academic Affairs directs each dean or unit head to develop his/her area's needs through each department chair, who communicates with the faculty and analyzes program review and assessment results to develop departmental needs. The other areas, which include the President, Business Affairs, and Student Affairs, follow a similar procedure.
- As stated earlier, the Reserve Balance has increased from 3.6% in fiscal year 2008-09 to approximately 8.0% in fiscal year 2012-13 (state guidelines say that a healthy reserve balance is 8.3% of the institution's annual budget), and the Composite Financial Index has increased from 0.55 to 2.43 during the same basic time period. In addition, SE's current goal is to have a Composite Financial Index between 2.5 and 3.0 in the near future.
- As a public institution, SE is becoming less of a state-supported institution and more of a tuition-supported institution. State appropriations have declined from 50.11% in fiscal year 2008-09 to 41.79% in fiscal year 2012-13. During this same time period, tuition and fees have increased from 46.29% to 54.46%.
- Some members of the faculty expressed confusion about institutional planning processes. This confusion may be due to a lack of interest or engagement but has

indeed led to an informal process that can unintentionally create exclusion and lack of transparency. It is recommended that a more formal process of planning be initiated that reconnects to overt governance structures, either by making room for the Harvard groups and initiatives to be reprogrammed into existing structures and governance bodies or by supplanting them with established groups of faculty and staff with communication links back to the existing Harvard planning groups. In detail, a number of suggestions were repeatedly put forward during the site visit such as formal ways to provide input into budget deliberations, a clear role for the academic council, national searches for open executive positions rather than internal selections announced after the appointment is made.

Core Component 5D: The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

Subcomponent 1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

Subcomponent 2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Team Determination: Core Component is met
 Core Component is met with concerns
 Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- SE engages in systematic and integrated planning. The various planning processes are wide-reaching and follow a continuous quality improvement model effectively. Planning and budgeting are linked, as are other major activities on campus, including master facilities planning and technology planning. Particularly in the area of resource generation, much progress is being made. Good results in advancement are producing endowed and annual funding as well as solid grants funding. The Presidential Partners program has brought in over \$70,000 in funding for selected initiatives. Partnerships with the city of Durant have resulted in infrastructure improvements for the town and the campus that would otherwise have gone unrealized. Together with regional leaders, faculties in the business program have advanced to AACSB accreditation, with excellence and rigor to contribute to emerging businesses in the region.
- Tenure-track faculty members are evaluated annually by their department chair and the Dean of Instruction. They are also evaluated by the portfolios they submit when they apply for promotion and/or tenure. Evaluations are made in the three general areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Tenured faculty members undergo post-tenure review every three years, and they are also evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Adjunct faculty members are evaluated by their department chairs. In addition, all faculty members are evaluated by student evaluations that are administered in their classes.
- The Dean of Instruction holds periodic “Faculty Development” days, where faculty members get to present (and hear) what their fellow faculty members from other areas have been doing in regards to research. In addition, the Faculty Senate holds “brown-bag lunches” at least once a month, with each of these informal sessions revolving around a particular topic related to teaching or scholarship. These various events have

led directly to new research that is being conducted by interdisciplinary teams of faculty members across the campus.

- Staff development occurs in some of the same ways as listed above for faculty. However, there is another venue at SE by which staff development occurs, and that is through a program known as “Southeastern Organizational Leadership Development” (SOLD). There are currently two different levels of SOLD that staff members are able to complete.

Team Determination on Criterion Five:

- Criterion is met
- Criterion is met with concerns
- Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

SE engages in systematic planning processes that have resulted in improvements across many sectors of the institution. The budget is allocated to meet institutional priorities and there have been instances where low enrollment programs were eliminated and resources redistributed to meet needs in high demand areas. Through its planning and budgeting processes, SE is developing the capacity to respond to emerging higher education trends and positioning itself for future enrollment growth. The President’s thoughtful approach to planning and his desire to reach beyond campus boundaries to include community partners bodes well for the future of the institution and region.

V. TEAM RECOMMENDATION

A. Affiliation Status

1. **Recommendation:** Reaffirmation of Accreditation
2. **Timing for Next Reaffirmation Evaluation:** Recommend Open Pathways
3. **Rationale:** Southeastern Oklahoma State University addressed all concerns noted in the previous visit and has five consecutive years of improved financial standing. The CFI has increased from .55 to 2.43 in the period between 2008 and 2013. Reserves are approaching 8.3% of the overall budget, up from 3.6% in 2008. SE operates under the oversight of the coordinating board, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) and the governing board of the six regional institutions, the Board of Regents for the Regional University System of Oklahoma (RUSO). The state higher education system creates ample oversight and assurance of institutional transparency, responsiveness, and academic quality. SE’s mission is well articulated, embraced by multiple constituencies, and serves the common good. There are robust planning processes that promote continuous improvement and assist with change management. The budgeting process is linked to program assessment, enrollment management, regional initiatives, and overall planning processes. Program assessment is embedded across the University and the recently purchased software product, TaskStream, provides consistency and manageability of assessment across all units. Shared governance is apparent through policies, governance structures, and the self-study process. Academic departments have ownership and oversight of programs including those delivered at a distance. There is increased emphasis on student

success through the development of a Native American Success Center and faculty develop has received additional funding. Through review of the self-study document, institutional artifacts, interviews, and meetings, the institution demonstrates that it meets the criteria for accreditation.

4. **Criterion-related Monitoring Required (report, focused visit): None**

5. **Federal Compliance Monitoring Required (report, focused visit): None**

B. Commission Sanction or Adverse Action

None

VI. EMBEDDED CHANGES IN AFFILIATION STATUS

Did the team review any of the following types of change in the course of its evaluation? Check Yes or No for each type of change.

- () Yes (X) No Legal Status
- () Yes (X) No Degree Level
- () Yes (X) No Program Change
- () Yes (X) No Distance or Correspondence Education
- () Yes (X) No Contractual or Consortial Arrangements
- () Yes (X) No Mission or Student Body
- () Yes (X) No Clock or Credit Hour
- () Yes (X) No Additional Locations or Campuses
- () Yes (X) No Access to Notification
- () Yes (X) No Access to Expedited Desk Review
- () Yes (X) No Teach-out Arrangement
- () Yes (X) No Other Change

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS

None

Appendix A

Interactions with Constituencies

President
Executive Assistant to the President
Special Assistant to the President/Director of Institutional Diversity and AAO
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Vice President for Student Affairs
Vice President for Business Affairs
Executive Director for University Advancement
Executive Director for Information Technology
Assistant VPAA Student Learning and Accreditation
Dean of Instruction
Dean of Enrollment Management
Director of Finance and Comptroller
Library Director
Director of the Career Center and Continuing Education
Director of Financial Aid
Registrar
Interim Dean of Graduate and University Studies
Assistant Dean Adult and Online Education
Mayor of Durant
Director of Chamber of Commerce
Executive Director, Durant Industrial Authority
President, SE Alumni Association
Superintendent, Durant ISD
Area Manager, AT&T
Community Affairs Manager, OG&E
President, First National Bank
President, Vision Bank
Foundation Board Member
Member, Choctaw Nation
Member, Chickasaw Nation
RUSO Board Members (2)
Executive Budget Council
Executive Team (10)
Planning Group/Administrative Council (28)
Academic Council (13)
Center for Instructional Development and Technology (3)
Faculty Senate Executive Committee (7)
Faculty Meeting (99)
SE Foundation Board (3)
Department Faculty Representatives (12)
Academic Advising and Learning Center (4)
Title III/Native American Success Initiatives (5)
Organized Research and Program Review (5)
Office of Research and Funded Programs (2)
General Education Council (12)
Curriculum Committee (6)

Graduate Council (8)
Academic Admissions and Learning Center (6)
Institutional Assessment Committee ((6)
Distance Education Council (26)
Distance Education Support Services (7)
Retention and Graduation Task Force (12)
Facilities Planning (2)
SGA Representatives (3)
Student Meeting (55)
Staff Association (5)
Staff Meeting (86)

Appendix B

Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed

Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog, 2013-2015
2012-2013 Enrollment Management Plan
Admissions and Recruitment Goals 2012
Learning Center Assessment Report 2012
Registrar Mission
Academic Advising and Outreach Center Assessment Plan-Report 2012-13
Financial Aid KPIs 2010-13
Counseling Center Assessment Plan 12-13
Educational Opportunity Center Assessment Plan-Report 2011-12
Office Violence Prevention Assessment Plan-Report 2008-2012
SSS Project TEACH Assessment Plan 2012-14
Student Support Services Plan-Report 2012-13
Upward Bound Assessment Plan 2011-12
Dean of Students Office Assessment Plan
Office for Student Life Assessment Plan
Residence Life Assessment Plan 2013-14
Student Health & Wellness Center Operation Plan
Talent Search Plan-Report 2011-12
Diversity Fact Sheet 2013
GenEd Assessment Plan (Pre TaskStream)
HLC Mission Survey
Library Assessment Plan
SE Marketing Plan 2010-11
Technology Improvements
Choctaw U Press Release 2-15-2012
GenEd Assessment (TaskStream)
GenEd Monitoring Report and Staff Analysis Form 2007
HLC Self-Study Survey
Library Strategic Plan 2011-15
SE Mission Statement
Course Syllabi

TaskStream
Vision 2015
Harvard Professional Development Program Participant List
Academic Renewal-Forgiveness
DOE Title IV Approval Letter 12-5-2013
FERPA Release of Records Form
Agreement between East Central University and SOSU
Organized Research Policy 2013-14
SE Academic Policies Procedures Manual
SE Administrative Organization Chart
Title IV Compliance Task Force Charge
DOE Eligibility-Certification Approval Report 12-12-2013
DOE Transmittal Letter 11-5-2013
Graduate Academic Appeal
Independent Audit Report 06-30-2011, 06-30-2012
OSRHE Policy Manual
RUSO Policy Manual
SE Employee-Handbook
Appendix-G1 Faculty Development & Evaluation Summary
HLC Invitation for Notification Letter 8-3-2010
Organized Research Policy 2013-14
SE Curricular Change Procedure
SE Distance Delivery Confirmation Form
Common Data Set 2012-13
Faculty Incentive Pay Policy 2013-14
HLC Approval Notification Location Letter 7-16-2013
Professional Development Program: Chronology of Major Events
SE DE Change Panel Letter 12-3-12
SE Multi-Site Visit Report 4-7-20
Academic Advising and Outreach Center Assessment Plan-Report 2012-13
Key Performance Indicators New
Native American Center Student Success Goals Report 2012
Admission Recruitment Report
Learning Center Assessment Report 2012
Counseling Center Assessment Report 2012-13
Educational Opportunity Center Assessment Report 2011-12
Project TEACH (SSS) Assessment Report 2011-12
Student Health Wellness Center Operational Report 2012-13
Talent Search Assessment Report 2011-12
Dean of Student, OSL, SU Assessment Report 2012-13
Office Violence Prevention Assessment Plan-Report 2008-2012

Residence Life Assessment Report 2011-12
Student Support Services Assessment Reports 2006-07 - 2011-12
Upward Bound Assessment Report 2011-12
JMSB AACSB Fifth-year Maintenance of Accreditation Report
MS Aerospace Administration Logistics 2013
Academic Program Review Guide 2012-13
Library Annual Report 2012-13
Library Strategic Plan 2011-15
Retention Graduation Task Force Report 2012-13
SE-Retention-Study-2012
2012-2013 Enrollment Management Plan
Library Assessment Plan 2011
Faculty Senate Survey Analysis 2012
The Magnolia Magazine and Foundation Annual Report (Fall 2008, Fall 2009, Fall 2010, Fall 2011, Fall 2012, and Fall 2013)
Honors Composition Publication (2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012)
Faculty-Staff Recognition Banquet Program Booklet and Video (2013)
Native American Initiatives, Southeastern Oklahoma State University (February 2012)
Current Degree Plans for each Undergraduate and Graduate Program (3-ring notebook)
Southeastern Oklahoma State University/RUSO Information Sheet (Fall 2013)
SE Update Newsletters (monthly newsletters from September 2012-February 2014)
Recruitment Materials (3-ring notebook with all documents for 2012-2014 cycle)
Polishing the Stone, Annual Report for the Center for Rhetoric and Professional Development (2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013)
End-of-Year Report for Textbook Reserve Program (2010-2011 and 2012-2013)
Institutional Degree Completion and Academic Plans, 2012-2013 (submitted to OSRHE)
Annual Assessment Report (2011, 2012, and 2013)
Chapter 3.14 Undergraduate Degree Requirements of the OSRHE Policy and Procedures Manual
All documents provided to Department of Education auditors during June 2013 site visit

- Advance Information Notebook
- File Box of Information used by Auditors
- Federal Student Aid Eligibility and Certification Documents
- Program Participation Agreement
- Information for Federal Compliance Section of Report
- Title IV Compliance Task Force Documentation

SE Degree Completion and Academic Plan 2013-14
Novel Levitz Report 10-2012
Technology Improvements
SE Federal Compliance Document 2013-14
Credit Hour Worksheet 2012-13 for Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Schedule of Classes 2012-13 for Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Appendix C

Federal Compliance Worksheet

Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Effective September 1, 2013 – August 31, 2014

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Teams should expect institutions to address these requirements with brief narrative responses and provide supporting documentation, where necessary. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in appropriate sections of the Assurance Section of the Team Report or highlighted as such in the appropriate AQIP Quality Checkup Report.

This worksheet outlines the information the team should review in relation to the federal requirements and provides spaces for the team's conclusions in relation to each requirement. The team should refer to the Federal Compliance Guide for Institutions and Evaluation Teams in completing this worksheet. The Guide identifies applicable Commission policies and an explanation of each requirement. **The worksheet becomes an appendix to the team's report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, it should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section in the team report template.**

Institution under review: Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Assignment of Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Address this requirement by completing the "Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours" in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

1. Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints as well as the history of complaints received and processed with a particular focus in that history on the past three or four years.
2. Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
3. Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into its review and planning processes.
4. Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
5. Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.

6. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

The institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.

1. Review the institution's transfer policies.
2. Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and program-specific articulation agreements.
3. Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its web site) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions and any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. Note whether the institution appropriately lists its articulation agreements with other institutions on its website or elsewhere. The information the institution provides should include any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution under Commission review: 1) accepts credit from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; 2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements that it accepts; or 3) both offers and accepts credits with the other institution(s).

4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education and appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.

1. Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams, and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
2. Check that any fees related to verification and not included in tuition are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance courses (e.g., a proctoring fee paid by students on the day of the proctored exam).
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.

This requirement has several components the institution and team must address:

- **General Program Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Five if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)*
- **Default Rates.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its three year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note for 2012 and thereafter institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact Commission staff.*

- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.*
 - **Student Right to Know.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)*
 - **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook. Note that the Commission does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.*
 - **Contractual Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*
 - **Consortial Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*
1. Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
 2. Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor in the A-133 has raised any issues about the institution's compliance as well as look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
 3. If an institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the federal compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
 4. If issues have been raised with the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Component 2.A and 2.B*).
 5. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

In reviewing the three-year federal default rate, SE's default rate has climbed over the three-year period resulting in a 14.8% default rate in 2011. To help Oklahoma schools manage this, the Oklahoma College Assistance Program under the OSRHE recently contracted with Student Outreach Solutions, Inc. to provide specialized education loan counseling services for Oklahoma students across institutions to promote student loan repayment and reduce cohort default rates.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Required Information for Students and the Public

1. Verify that the institution publishes fair, accurate, and complete information on the following topics: the calendar, grading, admissions, academic program requirements, tuition and fees, and refund policies.
2. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

The institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with the Commission and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.

1. Review the institution's disclosure about its accreditation status with the Commission to determine whether the information it provides is accurate and complete, appropriately formatted and contains the Commission's web address.

2. Review institutional disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
3. Review the institution's catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, and information provided by the institution's advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate information to current and prospective students about its accreditation, placement or licensure, program requirements, etc.
4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether it is appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs it offers and the students it serves.
2. Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about academic programs and requirements and to determine its effectiveness in achieving its educational objectives.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies

The institution has documented that it discloses accurately to the public and the Commission its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team has considered any potential implications for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or loss of authorization in any state.

Important note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial, or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this action. In addition, the team must contact the staff liaison immediately if it learns that the institution is at risk of losing its degree authorization or lacks such authorization in any state in which the institution meets state presence requirements.

1. Review the information, particularly any information that indicates the institution is under sanction or show-cause or has had its status with any agency suspended, revoked, or terminated, as well as the reasons for such actions.
2. Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the Commission staff liaison immediately.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment

*The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comments. The team has evaluated any comments received and completed any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments. **Note that if the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comment relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report.***

1. Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including sample announcements, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.

2. Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow-up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list materials reviewed here:

Academic Catalog
 Academic Calendar
 Academic Policies and Procedures Manual
 Academic Program Review Guide
 Academic Program Assessment Reviews 2013
 Accreditation Findings
 Clery Report
 Consortial Agreements
 Course Schedules
 Course Syllabi
 Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time Worksheet 2012-13
 DE Student Identification Requirements
 DOE Title IV Approval Letter 12-05-13
 DOE Eligibility-Certification Letter Approval Report 12-12-13
 EthicsPoint
 FERPA Release of Records Form
 GenEd Assessment Plan and TaskStream
 GenEd Assessment
 HLC Approval Notification Location Letter 7-16-2013
 Independent Audit Report 06-30-11
 Independent Audit Report 06-30-12
 Key Performance Indicators New
 Marketing and Recruiting Materials
 OSRHE Policy Manual
 Retention Graduation TF Report 2012-13
 RUSO Policy Manual
 Schedule of Classes 2012-13
 Self-Study Report Federal Compliance Documents
 Student Complaints Log
 TaskStream Program Assessments

Total Credit Hour Distribution 2012-13

Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Program Length and Tuition, Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours

Institution under review: Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Part 1: Program Length and Tuition

Instructions

The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

Review the "*Worksheet for Use by Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours*" as well as the course catalog and other attachments required for the institutional worksheet.

Worksheet on Program Length and Tuition

A. Answer the Following Questions

Are the institution's degree program requirements within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

 Yes No

Comments:

Are the institution's tuition costs across programs within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

 Yes No

Comments:

B. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's program length and tuition practices?

 Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2: Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps:

1. Review the Worksheet completed by the institution, which provides information about an institution's academic calendar and an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats, and the institution's policy and procedures for awarding credit hours. Note that such policies may be at the institution or department level and may be differentiated by such distinctions as undergraduate or graduate, by delivery format, etc.
2. Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level. The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - Master's or other degrees beyond the Bachelor's = at least 30 hours beyond the Bachelor's degree
 - Note that one quarter hour = .67 semester hour
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
3. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution.
 - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14-16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The description in the catalog should indicate a course that is appropriately rigorous and has collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
 - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
 - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode, and types of academic activities.
 - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the above federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. Commission procedure also permits this approach.
4. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course. Pay particular attention to alternatively-structured or other courses with particularly high credit hours for a course completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor.
5. **Sampling.** Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.

- At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
 - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
 - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
 - For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
 - The team should pay particular attention to alternatively-structured and other courses that have high credit hours and less frequently scheduled interaction between the students and the instructor.
 - Provide information on the samples in the appropriate space on the worksheet.
6. Consider the following questions:
- Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
 - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
 - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe allotted for the course?
 - Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)
 - If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently-detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and evidence of implementation.
 - If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or single department or division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
 - If the team identifies systematic non-compliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify Commission staff immediately and work with staff to design appropriate follow-up activities. The Commission shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted

practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team (see #5 of instructions in completing this section)

B. Answer the Following Questions

1) Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

Yes No

Comments:

Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

Yes No

Comments:

For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes No

Comments:

Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

2) Application of Policies

Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit?

Yes No

Comments:

If the institution offers any alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, were the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

Yes No

Comments:

If the institution offers alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonably capable of being fulfilled by students in the time allocated to justify the allocation of credit?

Yes No

Comments:

Is the institution's actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments:

C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this section. If the team has responded "no" to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign Commission follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's credit hour policies and practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:

D. Identify and Explain Any Findings of Systematic Non-Compliance in One or More Educational Programs with Commission Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Part 3: Clock Hours

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours?

Yes No

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

Yes No

If the answer to either question is “Yes,” complete this part of the form.

Instructions

This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Complete this worksheet **only if** the institution offers any degree or certificate programs in clock hours OR that must be reported to the U.S. Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs. Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock-hour programs might include teacher education, nursing, or other programs in licensed fields.

For these programs Federal regulations require that they follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution’s overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction provided that the student’s work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8)

1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution’s requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour include at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours

A. Answer the Following Questions

Does the institution’s credit to clock hour formula match the federal formula?

Yes No

Comments:

If the credit to clock hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class?

Did the team determine that the institution's credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers "No" to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

Yes

No

Comments:

Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes

No

Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution's credit to clock hour conversion?

Yes

No

(Note that the team may approve a lower conversion rate than the federal rate as noted above provided the team found no issues with the institution's policies or practices related to the credit hour and there is sufficient student work outside of class as noted in the instructions.)

C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's clock hour policies and practices?

Yes

No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:



STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS WORKSHEET

INSTITUTION and STATE: Southeastern Oklahoma State University OK

TYPE OF REVIEW: Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:

DATES OF REVIEW: 02/24/2014 - 02/26/2014

No Change in Statement of Affiliation Status

Nature of Organization

CONTROL: Public

RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE

DEGREES AWARDED: Bachelors, Masters

RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE

Conditions of Affiliation

STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS:

None.

RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE

APPROVAL OF NEW ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS:

The institution has been approved for the Notification Program, allowing the institution to open new additional locations within the United States.

RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE

APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREES:

Approved for distance education courses and programs.

*Recommendations for the
STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS*

RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE

ACCREDITATION ACTIVITIES:

RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE

Summary of Commission Review

YEAR OF LAST REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2003 - 2004

YEAR FOR NEXT REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2013 - 2014

RECOMMENDATION: 2023-2024



ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

INSTITUTION and STATE: 1639 Southeastern Oklahoma State University OK

TYPE OF REVIEW: PEAQ: Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:

No change to Organization Profile

Educational Programs

	<u>Program Distribution</u>
Programs leading to Undergraduate	
Associates	0
Bachelors	40
Programs leading to Graduate	
Masters	12
Specialist	0
Doctors	0
Certificate programs	
Certificate	0

Recommended Change:

Off-Campus Activities:

In State - Present Activity
Campuses: None.

Additional Locations:

- University Center of Southern Oklahoma - Ardmore, Oklahoma, OK
- McCurtain County Campus - Idabel, OK
- McAlester Higher Education Center - McAlester, Oklahoma, OK
- Rose State College Aviation Program - Midwest City, OK
- Tinker Air Force Base - Midwest City, Oklahoma, OK
- Oklahoma City Community College Aviation Program - Oklahoma City, OK

Recommended Change:

Out Of State - Present Activity
Campuses: None.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Additional Locations:

Grayson County College - Denison, TX

Grayson College--South Campus - Van Alstyne, TX

Recommended Change:

Out of USA - Present Activity

Campuses: None.

Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change:

Distance Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

Bachelor 54.0101 History, General History Internet

Bachelor 13.1314 Physical Education Teaching and Coaching Health and Physical Education Internet

Bachelor 45.1001 Political Science and Government, General Political Science Internet

Bachelor 13.1305 English/Language Arts Teacher Education English Education Internet

Bachelor 23.0101 English Language and Literature, General English Internet

Bachelor 13.1202 Elementary Education and Teaching Elementary Education Internet

Bachelor 03.0101 Natural Resources/Conservation, General Fisheries and Wildlife Internet

Bachelor 40.0501 Chemistry, General Chemistry Internet

Bachelor 26.0101 Biology/Biological Sciences, General Biology Internet

Bachelor 49.0102 Airline/Commercial/Professional Pilot and Flight Crew Aviation-Professional Pilot Internet

Bachelor 13.1302 Art Teacher Education Art Education Internet

Bachelor 50.0701 Art/Art Studies, General Art Internet

Bachelor 47.0607 Airframe Mechanics and Aircraft Maintenance Technology/Technician Aviation Management Internet

Bachelor 52.0301 Accounting Accounting Internet

Bachelor 52.1301 Management Science Management Internet

Bachelor 27.0101 Mathematics, General Mathematics Internet

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Bachelor 13.1311 Mathematics Teacher Education Mathematics Education Internet

Bachelor 50.0901 Music, General Music Internet

Bachelor 13.1312 Music Teacher Education Music Education Internet

Bachelor 31.0101 Parks, Recreation and Leisure Studies Recreation Internet

Bachelor 42.0101 Psychology, General Psychology Internet

Bachelor 13.1316 Science Teacher Education/General Science Teacher Education Science Education Internet

Bachelor 45.1101 Sociology Sociology Internet

Bachelor 13.1318 Social Studies Teacher Education Social Studies Education Internet

Bachelor 09.0101 Speech Communication and Rhetoric Communication Internet

Bachelor 11.0101 Computer and Information Sciences, General Computer Science Internet

Bachelor 15.0701 Occupational Safety and Health Technology/Technician Occupational Safety and Health Internet

Bachelor 43.0104 Criminal Justice/Safety Studies Criminal Justice Internet

Bachelor 50.0501 Drama and Dramatics/Theatre Arts, General Theatre Internet

Bachelor 11.0401 Information Science/Studies Computer Information Systems Internet

Bachelor 26.1201 Biotechnology Biotechnology Internet

Bachelor 52.1401 Marketing/Marketing Management, General Marketing Internet

Bachelor 52.0801 Finance, General Finance Internet

Bachelor 13.1099 Special Education and Teaching, Other Special Education-Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internet

Bachelor 09.9999 Communication, Journalism, and Related Programs, Other Graphic Design and Visual Media Internet

Bachelor 24.0102 General Studies Liberal and Applied Studies Internet

Master 31.0504 Sport and Fitness Administration/Management Sports Studies and Athletic Administration Internet

Bachelor 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General General Business Internet

Bachelor 13.1330 Spanish Language Teacher Education Spanish Education Internet

Bachelor 16.0905 Spanish Language and Literature Spanish Internet

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Bachelor 30.9999 Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other Organizational Leadership Internet

Master 13.1202 Elementary Education and Teaching Elementary Education--Reading Specialist Internet

Master 13.0401 Educational Leadership and Administration, General School Administration Internet

Master 13.1205 Secondary Education and Teaching Master of Arts in Teaching Internet

Master 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Business Administration Internet

Master 52.0205 Operations Management and Supervision Technology Internet

Master 15.0703 Industrial Safety Technology/Technician Occupational Safety and Health Internet

Master 13.1311 Mathematics Teacher Education Mathematics Specialist Internet

Recommended Change:

Correspondence Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change:

Contractual Relationships:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change:

Consortial Relationships:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change:
